UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,400	03/05/2001	Alan Tsu-I Yaung	1954P/STL920000109US1	2684

7590   12/07/2006

SAWYER LAW GROUP
P.O. Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER
SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/800,400
Filing Date: March 05, 2001
Appellant(s): YAUNG ET AL.

MAILED

DEC 0 7 2006

Technology Center 2100

Janyce R. Mitchell
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 9/25/2006 appealing from the Office action

mailed 2/2/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial

proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the

Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection

contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is

correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6546387	Triggs	11-1999
6714219	Lindhorst	12-1998

| 6697825 | Underwood | 8-2000 |
| 20020138582 | Chandra* | 9-2000 |

*Examiner notes that The Appellant mistakenly omitted the citation for the

Chandra reference on page 4 of the Brief.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7-8, 10, 13-17 and 20-21are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triggs (US Patent 6546387 B1, filed Nov 15, 1999), in view of Chandra et al (US 2002/0138582, provisional filed 9/5/2000), further in view of Lindhorst et al (US 6714219, filed Dec 31, 1998).

Regarding claim 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 21, Triggs discloses a *message caching agent for receiving messages; coupled to the message caching agent for storing the messages, the message caching receiving the messages from the message caching agent; and a message publishing agent coupled to cache and page builder for publishing messages on the web browser through the page builder tool.* For example,

Triggs teaches an information management system using intelligent software agents,

where the agents monitor email accounts and publish the messages received, which

can be used to implement automated customer support where intelligent responses are

required for inbound messages (col 5, lines 45-51) which are eventually published as

HTML documents (col 6, lines 1-3). The messages are catalogued and transmitted to

the client node to overcome the need in the art of publishing information (col 2, lines 35-

43; col 1, line 66). For example, after the information collection agent collects the

messages, the Web Builder allows employees to build simple pages on the Internet and

the Deliver Agent uses agent technology to deliver all the information to those

employees to whom it is relevant (col 4, lines 13-55). The data is cached on the

networked connected system all of the agents are linked together and are integrated

completely within the overall message publishing system. The agents place the content

of individual web pages into categories within the central server database (col 6, lines

45-47), which is linked to the client machines and operates as one web builder system

(col 8, lines 59-62). Once the system begins its processing, the information is uploaded

to the holding server (which the examiner interprets as a message cache), transferred

to the web server and employees will be notified of the new content (col 8, lines 59-65).

The content is delivered to the client employee computer where no client side software

is needed on the standard browser in order to receive the message because the

delivery agent automatically handles delivery to the client employees (col 10, lines 19-

48).

Triggs discloses Delivery Agent to deliver all the information to those employees to whom it is relevant (col 4, lines 13-55) where the content is delivered to the client employee computer where no client side software is needed on the standard browser in order to receive the message because the delivery agent automatically handles delivery to the client employees (col 10, lines 19-48). The examiner interprets the automatic delivery of messages for standard browsers by the deliver agent as equivalent to the pushing of the message to the web browser.

Triggs does not expressly teach a *local cache*, however, Chandra teaches electronic messages which are stored on a local cache on a client machine (paragraph 341 and 362), which, when combined with the Triggs reference, teaches the claimed portion of a message cache being a local cache in an effort to develop a method for aggregating related topical information or webs of messages (Chandra, para 33). This teaching is a similar objective of Triggs, which is to implement an automated customer support system to automatically categorize the received email messages utilizing catalog agents (col 5, lines 45-51). Triggs does disclose that information is uploaded to the holding server (which the examiner interprets as equivalent to a message cache), transferred to the web server and employees will be notified of the new content (col 8, lines 59-65).

Triggs in view of Chandra does not expressly teach *pushing the message* (although Triggs does suggest it in col 10, lines 19-48), Lindhorst does expressly disclose broadcasting using a push web model (col 15, lines 15-18) to support Triggs' teachings of deliver agents.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Triggs to include a client with a page builder that allows users to assemble different building blocks that enables the viewing of application off-line by creating snapshot of application in a local cache as taught by Chandra, providing the benefit of a communication system that provides ways to share messages, providing the best features of e-mail, the web and instant messaging, linking messages to other related messages to obtain a view of complex webs of messages and methods and mechanisms that can aggregate related topical information within the context of a single message or web of messages (Chandra, para 28 – 33).

Furthermore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Triggs in view Chandra to include web page editing with scripts for broadcasting using a push web model, without a request from a browser as taught by Lindhorst, providing the benefit of a richer, faster and more interactive web site, with data published without user request (Lindhorst, col 1, lines 27, 38) for web broadcasting (col 15, line 17).

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 17, Triggs does not explicitly teach, but Chandra teaches that a publishing agent is a servlet. Chandra discloses a plurality of servlet constructs that implement the services, where the mail formatter, which may be implemented in the form of dynamic content creation servlets where the web page formatter is for formatting web pages (para 211).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Triggs to include web page formatters with a plurality of servlet

constructs that implement the services as taught by Chandra, providing the benefit of a

communication system that provides ways to share messages, providing the best

features of e-mail, the web and instant messaging, linking messages to other related

messages to obtain a view of complex webs of messages and methods and

mechanisms that can aggregate related topical information within the context of a single

message or web of messages (Chandra, para 28 – 33).

Regarding claims 6, 13 and 20, Triggs teaches a message publishing tool for

allowing a user to create the message and provide the message caching agent. Triggs

discloses a Web Builder to build web sites and publish them to the client/employee (col

8, lines 49-67).

Claims 4-5, 11-12, 18-19 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Triggs (as cited and applied to claims 1, 7, 14,

respectively above) and Chandra (as cited above), in view of Lindhorst (as cited

above), further in view of Underwood et al (US Patent 6697825 B1, filed Aug 2000).

Regarding dependent claims 4, 5, 11,12, 18,19, 22 and 23, The rejection of

independent claims 1, 7 and 14 are incorporated and further, Triggs discloses *a*

message publishing macro definition coupled to the page builder tool. For example,

Triggs discloses messages that are catalogued and transmitted to the client node to

overcome the need in the art of publishing information (col 2, lines 35-43; col 1, line 66).

For example, after the information collection agent collects the messages, the Web

Builder allows employees to build simple pages on the Internet and the Deliver Agent

uses agent technology to deliver all the information to those employees to whom it is

relevant (col 4, lines 13-55). The automated delivery is equivalent to being broadcasted and pushed because the disclosed deliver agent automatically delivers all information to the employees (Triggs, col 4, lines 53-54). Delivering information automatically is the same as broadcasting the information, where the information is published as HTML document in specified categories (Triggs, col 6, lines 1-3)(Triggs, col 10, lines 19-21).

Triggs in view of Chandra does not expressly teach, but Lindhorst does suggest the *message publishing macro definition processed by the page builder tool in response to a request from the web browser, the message publishing macro definition for triggering publishing of the messages in response to processing of the message publishing macro-definition by the page builder tool, wherein the message publishing macro definition includes an applet for retrieving the message from the message publishing agent and publishing the message when the message publishing macro definition is processed by the page builder tool.* For example, Lindhorst discloses broadcasting using a push web model (col 15, lines 15-18) for web page script files according to an event-driven model where associated scripts are ultimately run on the client (col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 10). Lindhorst further discloses custom generated HTML documents in response to requests for specific information where the server would access a database in response to a search query and produce an HTML document that is sent to the browser, which is overcoming traditional art of pushing fixed documents and applets to browsers in response to a request (col 1, lines 50-65). Lindhorst's teachings show custom documents pushed to browsers in response to a search request.

Triggs in view of Chandra and Lindhorst does not expressly teach *macros*, but

Underwood does suggest it.   For example, Underwood discloses macros for producing

documents within Definer web-site for the callback messages (col 50, lines 37-67; figure

73; fig 20, item 2000)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Triggs in view of Chandra to include web page editing with scripts

for broadcasting using a push web model, without a request from a browser as taught

by Lindhorst, providing the benefit of a richer, faster and more interactive web site, with

data published without user request (Lindhorst, col 1, lines 27, 38) for web broadcasting

(col 15, line 17). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modify Triggs in view of Chandra and Lindhorst to

include macros with applets for producing documents with a web site as taught by

Underwood, providing the benefit of an improved method and apparatus for web site

generation that allows a user to make various selections regarding of a web site and for

the web site to maintain an overall consistency, regardless of the choices and collection

of various information from an external database to be used in making automatic

selections regarding the design of a web site (col 3, lines 50-67), further

(10) Response to Argument

On pages 5-7 of the Brief, the Appellant summarizes the cited prior art and

asserts that the prior references are distinguished from the appellant's invention. The

examiner disagrees because the references in combination would have led one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the references and arrive

at the appellant's invention (see detailed rejections above and detailed response to

arguments below).

Regarding claims 1-23, Appellant argues that the cited patent references

Triggs in view of Chandra and Lindhorst fail to teach the message caching agent

that stores the messages in the local message cache, and a message publishing

agent that retrieves the message from the message cache and pushes the

message to a browser, thus pushing the message through the page builder tool

(Brief, pages 7-11). The examiner disagrees.

Specifically, Triggs teaches an information management system using intelligent

software agents, where the agents monitor email accounts and publish the messages

received, which can be used to implement automated customer support where

intelligent responses are required for inbound messages (col 5, lines 45-51) which are

eventually published as HTML documents (col 6, lines 1-3). The messages are

catalogued and transmitted to the client node to overcome the need in the art of

publishing information (col 2, lines 35-43; col 1, line 66). For example, after the

information collection agent collects the messages, the Web Builder allows employees

to build simple pages on the Internet and the Deliver Agent uses agent technology to

deliver all the information to those employees to whom it is relevant (col 4, lines 13-55).

The data is cached on the networked connected system, all of the agents are linked

together and are integrated completely within the overall message publishing system.

The agents place the content of individual web pages into categories within the central

server database (col 6, lines 45-47). Once the system begins its processing, the

information is uploaded to the holding server (which the examiner interprets as a

message cache), transferred to the web server and employees will be notified of the

new content (col 8, lines 59-65). The content is delivered to the client employee

computer where no client side software is needed on the standard browser in order to

receive the message because the delivery agent automatically handles delivery to the

client employees (col 10, lines 19-48).

Appellant argues that in the references, *there is no need for a separate message*

cache or for the message to be retrieved from the message cache using a separate

entity, prior to the message being published (page 9, top). However, The claims do not

positively recite any limitations requiring "prior to the messages being published."

Appellant argues that Triggs in view of Chandra and Lindhorst fails to teach

pushing the message being published to the web browsers (Brief, page 9, middle). The

examiner disagrees. Triggs teaches Delivery Agent to deliver all the information to

those employees to whom it is relevant (col 4, lines 13-55) where the content is

delivered to the client employee computer where no client side software is needed on

the standard browser in order to receive the message because the delivery agent

automatic handles delivery to the client employees (col 10, lines 19-48). The examiner

interprets the automatically delivery of messages for standard browsers by the deliver

agent as equivalent to the pushing of the message to the web browser.

Triggs does not expressly teach "local cache", however, Chandra teaches

electronic messages stored on a local cache on a client machine (paragraph 341 and

362), which, when combined with the Triggs reference, teaches the claimed portion of a

message cache being a local cache in an effort to develop a method for aggregating

related topical information or webs of messages (Chandra, para 33), which is a similar

objective of Triggs, which is to implement an automated customer support system to

automatically categorize the received email messages utilizing catalog agents (col 5,

lines 45-51). Triggs does teach that information is uploaded to the holding server

(which the examiner interprets as equivalent to a message cache), transferred to the

web server and employees will be notified of the new content (col 8, lines 59-65).

The Appellant argues that the Triggs in view of Chandra and Lindhorst fails to

teach objects that would include messages being broadcast and being pushed to the

browser (Brief, page 10-11). The examiner disagrees. Triggs teaches messages that

are catalogued and transmitted to the client node to overcome the need in the art of

publishing information (col 2, lines 35-43; col 1, line 66). For example, after the

information collection agent collects the messages, the Web Builder allows employees

to build simple pages on the Internet and the Deliver Agent uses agent technology to

deliver all the information to those employees to whom it is relevant (col 4, lines 13-55).

The automated deliver is equivalent to being broadcasting and pushing because the

disclosed deliver agent automatically delivers all information to the employees (Triggs,

col 4, lines 53-54). Delivering information automatically is the same as broadcasting the

information, where the information is published as HTML document in specified

categories (Triggs, col 6, lines 1-3)(Triggs, col 10, lines 19-21).

Regarding dependent claims 4-5, 11-12, 18-19 and 22-23, Appellant argues

that reference Triggs in combination with Chandra, Underwood and Lindhorst

fails to teach a message caching agent to store the message to a message cache

that is local to and coupled to a page builder tool, retrieving messages from the

local cache using a message publishing agent to push the message to the

browser (Brief, page 11-12). The examiner disagrees.Triggs teaches messages that

are catalogued and transmitted to the client node to overcome the need in the art of

publishing information (col 2, lines 35-43; col 1, line 66). For example, after the

information collection agent collects the messages, the Web Builder allows employees

to build simple pages on the Internet and the Deliver Agent uses agent technology to

deliver all the information to those employees to whom it is relevant (col 4, lines 13-55).

The automated deliver is equivalent to being broadcasting and pushing because the

disclosed deliver agent automatically delivers all information to the employees (Triggs,

col 4, lines 53-54). Delivering information automatically is the same as broadcasting the

information, where the information is published as HTML document in specified

categories (Triggs, col 6, lines 1-3)(Triggs, col 10, lines 19-21).

Triggs does not expressly teach "local cache", however, Chandra teaches

electronic messages stored on a local cache on a client machine (paragraph 341 and

362), which, when combined with the Triggs reference, teaches the claimed portion of a

message cache being a local cache in an effort to develop a method for aggregating related topical information or webs of messages (Chandra, para 33), which is a similar objective of Triggs, which is to implement an automated customer support system to automatically categorize the received email messages utilizing catalog agents (col 5, lines 45-51). Triggs does teach information uploaded to the holding server (which the examiner interprets as equivalent to a message cache), transferred to the web server and employees will be notified of the new content (col 8, lines 59-65).

Lindhorst does expressly teach broadcasting using a push web model (col 15, lines 15-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Triggs in view of Chandra to include web page editing with scripts for broadcasting using a push web model, without a request from a browser as taught by Lindhorst, providing the benefit of a richer, faster and more interactive web site, with data published without user request (Lindhorst, col 1, lines 27, 38) for web broadcasting (col 15, line 17).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

GS 12/5/6

Gautam Sain

Patent Examiner

Conferees:

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Heather Herndon

Stephen Hong

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER